

SUMMARY OF CITIZEN INPUT ON SETBACKS, FENCES, LOT WIDTH AND OTHER ZONING ISSUES

****** IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER ******

The comments, suggestions and ideas contained in this document reflect those statements made by persons attending the Public Information Work Sessions and received by the Zoning Administration Division on this matter. They do not necessarily reflect the position of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, County Staff or any other group or individual. Nothing herein should be interpreted as an endorsement of any concept, acceptance of any suggestion, or as County support for any recommendation. Further, each comment reflects statements made by one or more individuals and should not be considered as the overall opinion or position of meeting attendees.

Public Information Work Sessions were held on the following dates and locations:

- 9/15/05 Meeting – McLean Government Center (MGC)
- 9/21/05 Meeting – South County Government Center (SCGC)
- 9/28/05 Meeting– James Lee Community Center Theatre (James Lee)
- 9/29/05 Meeting - North County Government Center (NCGC)
- 10/6/05 Meeting - Fairfax County Government Center (Gov. Ctr.)
- 10/11/05 Meeting – Braddock Hall (Braddock)

The following comments, suggestions and ideas were noted by participants of the Public Information Work Sessions or were conveyed to Staff by telephone, email or written correspondence. The issues identified track the format of the Table of Issues presented at the Work Sessions:

ISSUE #1 – Permit a reduction in the minimum required yards with special permit approval.

- Concern regarding the adverse impacts on surrounding properties. (MGC)
- Require a minimum lot width before a reduction of setbacks is considered. (MGC)
- The 50% reduction is too high and a lower cap may be more appropriate. (MGC)
- There should be no increase in lot yield as a result of approval of a setback reduction. (MGC)
- Consider allowing setback reductions in instances where there is unused right-of-way. (However, it was noted that this unused right-of-way may be needed for future road or trail improvements) (MGC)

- Allow a reduction in one yard if the opposite yard exceeds the minimum requirements and the combined width of the two yards equals a certain number (for example the two sides or the front and rear yards). (MGC)
- Standards must be strict enough to address only highly unusual circumstances (hardships). (MGC)
- Standard should be incorporated that states that the hardship was not caused by the property owner. (MGC)
- Consider adding provisions that are similar to the current provisions for special permits for modifications to the minimum yard requirements for certain R-C lots for those lots that were created prior to the current provisions and met the requirements when created but don't meet the current requirements. (MGC)
- Consider adding a standard that addresses lot coverage and/or building mass (FAR) issues. It was believed that lot coverage considerations would assist in maintaining the existing neighborhood character. (MGC)
- This proposal could assist in the preservation of older structures and/or historic structures. (MGC)
- This reduction could result in increased property tax revenues for the County. (MGC)
- Only homeowners and not builders or developers should be able to seek this modification and any granting of a special permit for a yard reduction should not transfer to a developer who tears down a house to build a new structure. (MGC)
- For lots that do not meet the current lot size requirements but met the lot size requirements in effect when created, require setbacks that equate to the most comparable zoning district based on lot size. (SCGC)
- The proposed 50% setback reduction is too much and a maximum reduction of 25% may be more appropriate. (SCGC)
- Questions whether this proposed special permit is really necessary. (SCGC)
- Include staff's previously proposed standards. (SCGC)
- The proposed 50% reduction may be appropriate in some cases. (SCGC)
- Concern was raised as to how this proposal relates to Issue #6. (SCGC)
- Even if the adjacent neighbors do not object, a setback reduction could still change the character of a neighborhood. (SCGC)
- Most of the need for setback modifications is the result of irregularly shaped lots, topography and existing vegetation. (SCGC)
- The proposed setback reduction should only be applicable to lots that were created prior to a certain date. (James Lee)
- Do not have any percentage limitations on the amount of possible setback reductions. (James Lee)
- The proposed 50% reduction is too large. (James Lee)
- Several examples were cited where the needed reduction was 10% or less of the required setbacks. (James Lee)
- This item should be considered prior to the items pertaining to fences and accessory structures. (James Lee)

- Houses located in close proximity to each other could be fire hazards. (James Lee)
- Standards are needed and the standards proposed with the previously authorized amendment are a good starting point. Standards should ensure that potential nuisances, such as noise and light, are minimized. (NCGC)
- In certain situations, such as when a property backs up to a common open space area and does not impact other properties, reductions beyond 50% should be permitted. It was also noted that some HOA covenants preclude the development of certain common areas. (NCGC)
- Impacts on not just the adjacent properties but surrounding/nearby properties that are reasonably impacted should be considered in the development of any standards. (NCGC)
- This item might facilitate the creation of irregularly shaped lots. (NCGC)
- An individual stated that this item was needed because they have outgrown their home and they wish to expand their home and remain in the community. (NCGC)
- Wants to see Issue #1 approved as soon as possible. (NCGC)
- There appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (NCGC)
- Supports this proposal as it would help her specific situation. (10/6/05 phone call)
- Modification of the minimum yard requirements should not result in a setback of less than a specified distance, such as 5 feet. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Require 50% undisturbed open space in R-C District. (Govt. Ctr.)
- All fire safety standards must be met. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Require special exception approval in lieu of the proposed special permit approval. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Should only be allowed one lot at a time. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Concern that this would result in large homes being built in an existing subdivision that contains small homes. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Supports because this proposal makes it possible to keep historic houses. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Limit the percentage of lot coverage. (Govt. Ctr.)
- This proposal is meaningful to growing families that need to expand their homes. It is essential that this proposal be adopted as quickly as possible. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Supports the proposal because a 50% reduction is needed in their situation. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Should apply only to residential uses located in residential districts. (Govt. Ctr.)
- This circumvents the Cochran Virginia Supreme Court decision. (Braddock)
- This should not apply to the construction of a new dwelling. (Braddock)
- Allow only for one lot. (Braddock)
- This should only apply to small, homeowner type improvements/uses. (Braddock)

- Allow some flexibility when neighbors do not object. (Braddock)

ISSUE #2 - Permit certain existing structures or off-street parking spaces that do not meet the current minimum setback requirements to remain when requesting a special exception or special permit for another use or structure on a lot.

- No specific issues were noted and there appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (MGC)
- There appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. However, one individual raised objections. (SCGC)
- There was no input on this issue. (James Lee)
- Good idea because it helps a person's particular situation. (NCGC)
- Standards are needed. (NCGC)
- Does not want a situation to develop where these types of requests are looked at less closely since the building/use is already there. (NCGC)
- Impacts on not just the adjacent properties but surrounding/nearby properties that are reasonably impacted should be considered in the development of any standards. (NCGC)
- There appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (NCGC)
- Should only be permitted with special exception applications. (Govt. Ctr.)
- No specific issues were noted and there appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (Braddock)

ISSUE #3 - Permit the BZA to reduce the 10 foot setback requirement between off-street parking spaces and the front lot line and the 10 foot wide peripheral parking lot landscaping requirement in conjunction with special permit approval for another use.

- No specific issues were noted and there appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (MGC)
- There was no input on this issue. (SCGC)
- There appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (James Lee)
- Not just adjacent properties but surrounding/nearby properties that are reasonably impacted should be considered in the development of any standards. (NCGC)
- Standards are needed. (NCGC)
- There appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (NCGC)
- No comments. (Govt. Ctr.)
- No specific issues were noted and there appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (Braddock)

ISSUE #4 - Permit egress/ingress to a basement to encroach into minimum required yards.

- There was no input on this issue. (MGC)
- There appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (SCGC)
- Basement access should not result in the encroachment of covered stairs or enclosed stairs with a door into minimum required yards, especially given that there are other design alternatives such as expanded window wells. (SCGC)
- This could result in more bedrooms in basements, leading to issues with multiple occupancy of a dwelling unit. (SCGC)
- Before such encroachment is permitted, it must be demonstrated that there is no other alternative locations on the site. (James Lee)
- Basement access should be treated in the same manner as the current regulations for fire escapes. (James Lee)
- Noted that this was means of emergency egress that is similar to a fire escape. (NCGC)
- There appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (NCGC)
- Makes sense from a safety standpoint. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Standards must be developed. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Do not allow such encroachments for new development. (Govt. Ctr.)
- There should be some reasonable width limitation and 10 feet may be too wide. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Should allow some type of roof or awning covering at entrance, but such access should not be fully enclosed. (Govt. Ctr.)
- No specific issues were noted and there appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (Braddock)

ISSUE #5 - Permit carport enclosures when such carport met the provisions in effect at the time of its construction.

- Concern was expressed that someone would build a carport with the intention of enclosing the carport in the future. Therefore, it was suggested that such carport enclosures would only be allowed for carports constructed prior to a certain date. (MGC)
- Should apply only to carports constructed prior to the adoption of the amendment. (SCGC)
- Concern was expressed that a carport enclosure adds additional bulk. (SCGC)
- There appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (SCGC)

- Special permits should only be allowed for carports that were not recently established. (James Lee)
- Carport enclosures should only be allowed when the existing carport was integrated into the overall design of the house and not when the carport was clearly an “add-on”. (James Lee)
- Should only apply to legally constructed carports. (James Lee)
- Impacts on not just the adjacent properties but surrounding/nearby properties that are reasonably impacted should be considered in the development of any standards. (NCGC)
- Standards are needed. (NCGC)
- There appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (NCGC)
- Such enclosure should only be used for garage purposes. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Does not support this recommendation. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Should have the same standards as Item #1. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Cars are designed to withstand the elements and carports are just fine, garages are not needed. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Require special exception approval for such carport enclosure. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Not in support of this proposal. (Braddock)
- For accessibility reasons carport enclosures should be allowed. (Braddock)
- Others are in support of this proposal because carport enclosures can be a way to upgrade an area. (Braddock)

ISSUE #6 - Permit a reduction in the minimum required yards for additions to existing structures when such structures do not meet the current minimum yard requirements but met the minimum yard requirements in effect when the structure was constructed. (pop-ups)

- Concern was expressed this could result in changing the character of a neighborhood and in multiple occupancy of a dwelling unit. (MGC)
- Question was raised as to whether someone with an approved variance could take advantage of this provision. (MGC)
- There appeared to be general overall consensus that this was a good idea. (SCGC)
- If someone is granted this special permit, they should not also be allowed to get a corresponding special exception for additional height. (SCGC)
- There appeared to be an overall consensus that this was a good idea, but it was also recognized that such additions could change the character of a neighborhood. (James Lee)
- The issue as stated on the summary chart prepared by staff should be clarified and redrafted. Concern regarding the possible expansion of a building footprint – particularly on the sides of the house. (NCGC)
- Impacts on not just the adjacent properties but surrounding/nearby properties that are reasonably impacted should be considered in the development of any standards. (NCGC)

- Standards are needed. (NCGC)
- Supports this proposal as it would help her specific situation. (10/6/05 phone call)
- Additions should meet today's setback standards. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Require special exception approval for such proposed addition. (Govt. Ctr.)
- No specific issues were noted and there appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (Braddock)

ISSUE #7 - Permit an increase in fence/wall height in front yards with special permit approval.

- Several citizens voiced support for this proposal. (MGC)
- Noted that under the current provisions an individual can seek special permit approval for an increase in fence height on lots located along major thoroughfares for highway noise attenuation purposes. As part of this special permit request, submission of a noise study is required. It was suggested that this current provision might be adequate and a new special permit use is not required. It was also suggested that the noise study submission requirement was too onerous and that the proposed special permit should be pursued. (MGC)
- Continue to require variances for fence height modifications as opposed to amending the Zoning Ordinance to allow modification for extraordinary circumstances. (MGC)
- A 6 foot tall fence in the front yard may not be appropriate on an historic byway, such as Georgetown Pike, or in Historic Overlay Districts. (MGC)
- A 6 ft. fence in the front yard may be necessary for security reasons, particularly when there is more than one front yard on a lot. (MGC)
- Questioned the original rational for the 4 foot front yard fence height limitation and why that rational is no longer valid. (MGC)
- Must demonstrate that adequate site distance can be provided. (SCGC)
- Since fences are not always the most aesthetic buffers, there are times when planting trees may be more appropriate. (SCGC)
- Increases in fence height should only be permitted when lots have unique circumstances, such as a lot containing only front yards. (SCGC)
- Fence height increases should be limited to certain lot configurations (corner lots and other lots with multiple front yards) and should be in character with fences on neighboring properties. (James Lee)
- Communities that are completely surrounded by fences or walls are unattractive. (James Lee)
- Hedges should be considered in lieu of fences for privacy and screening purposes. (James Lee)
- Maintain the existing fence height provisions. (James Lee)
- There appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (NCGC)
- Landscaping should be used in the front yard rather than fences. (Govt. Ctr.)

- Do not permit fences in any front yards. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Do not allow solid fences in front yards. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Above may not make sense in all cases. Supports this item because there are some situations where some flexibility should be provided. (Govt. Ctr.)
- This is reasonable, particularly on a corner lot. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Consider changing definition of a front yard so that there would only be one front yard on any lot. (Govt. Ctr.)
- This flexibility should be allowed in any front yard, not just corner lots. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Require special exception approval in lieu of the proposed special permit approval. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Only allow front yard fence height increase in certain circumstances such as on a lot with multiple front yards. (Braddock)
- Supports this proposal. (Braddock)

ISSUE #8 - Allow the Board to increase fence height in conjunction with rezoning or special exception approval for another use and allow the BZA to increase fence height in conjunction with special permit approval for another use.

- No specific issues were noted and there appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (MGC)
- There was no input on this issue. (SCGC).
- There was no input on this issue. (James Lee)
- Needs standards. (NCGC)
- There appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (NCGC)
- Allow only in conjunction with special exception approval for another use. (Govt. Ctr.)
- No specific issues were noted and there appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (Braddock)

ISSUE #9 - Allow the ZA to administratively increase fence height by 10% due to changes in topography.

- No specific issues were noted and there appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea to address minor topographic variations on a lot. (MGC)
- No specific issues were noted and there appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (SCGC)
- No specific issues were noted and there appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (James Lee)
- People may try to find loopholes with grading plan approval and the creation of berms. (NCGC)

- There appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (NCGC)
- Although there appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea, it was believed that 10% may be too much and the increase should be expressed in terms of “inches” rather than a percentage. (Govt. Ctr.)
- No specific issues were noted and there appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (Braddock)

ISSUE #10 - Permit an increase in fence/wall height for side or rear yards and/or consider methodology used in determining fence height.

- Suggested that the maximum allowable height of a fence should be based on an angle of bulk plane requirement – this would result in higher fences being allowed if setback further from the property line than if located at the property line. (MGC)
- Suggested that any lights on top of fence posts be strictly regulated to consider glare impacts on adjacent properties. (MGC)
- Lots having more than one front yard are more restricted in the location of fences than a lot with only one front yard. (MGC)
- Finials and light fixtures should not increase the height of a fence by more than 10 or 20%. (SCGC)
- There was no input on this issue. (James Lee)
- There was no input on this issue. (NCGC)
- Measurement should be to top of rail and allow a certain additional height for the posts. (Govt. Ctr.)
- This item should be combined with Item #9. (Gov’t Ctr.)
- Set maximum height limitation and/or tighten standards. (Braddock)
- Have certain percentage of fence remain open to ensure that the fence is not completely solid. (Braddock)

ISSUE #11 - Allow for a reduction of the minimum lot width requirements in residential districts with SE approval.

- Ensure that approval of a lot width special exception would not result in an increase in the overall lot yield. (MGC)
- There needs to be reasonable standards established in conjunction with this proposed special exception. (MGC)
- Concern was expressed that such a special exception could result in a subdivision being constructed with many pipestem lots and that there should be a limitation on the number of pipestem lots that could be approved in conjunction with this special exception and/or a maximum acreage limitation imposed. (MGC)

- Include a standard that addresses environmental issues such as tree preservation. (MGC)
- Include a standard that addresses impacts on surrounding development - compatibility/character issues. (MGC)
- Do not allow a reduction of setbacks in conjunction with the approval of a reduction of the minimum lot width requirements. (MGC)
- Appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea provided that such modification results only in lots that do not exceed the maximum density limitation and lots that meet the minimum lot area requirement of the district in which located. (SCGC)
- Reduction of a minimum lot width requirement should not increase lot yield. (James Lee)
- The standards proposed by staff in the previously authorized amendment should be less subjective. (James Lee)
- The current lot width requirements are too restrictive. (James Lee)
- Standards are important. (NCGC)
- There appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (NCGC)
- Does not support this recommendation. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Need standards. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Limit number of lots. It was suggested that this be applicable to only a two lot subdivision. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Concerned about irregularly shaped lots. (Braddock)
- Do not support because this could increase the lot yield and change the character of an area. (Braddock)

ISSUE #12 - Allow for increase in building height in residential districts with special exception approval.

- Concern was expressed that the methodology used for measuring building height under the Building Code may allow structures to exceed the maximum height limitations of the Zoning Ordinance. (9/16/05 phone call)
- Building height should be based on the grade that exists at the time of original construction and the height of any subsequent rebuilds or renovations should be based on the original grade and not on the finished grade. (9/16/05 phone call)
- Bad idea due to potential adverse impacts on surrounding properties. (SCGC)
- Good idea for fairness reasons because it results in the same process for building height increases for both residential and nonresidential properties. (SCGC)
- Good idea because the special exception process provides more opportunity for citizen input. (SCGC)
- Height increase could adversely impact character of neighborhoods. (James Lee)

- Height increase could change the character of a neighborhood. As such, there should be strong standards that ensure the protection of neighboring properties. (NCGC)
- Do not allow height increases for single family attached and detached dwellings. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Do not allow height increases in residential districts for residential or nonresidential uses. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Limit the height increase that is allowed. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Opposed because changes character of neighborhoods. (Braddock)
- Have a standard that prevents developers from seeking height increases on multiple lots. (Braddock)
- Add a standard that limits the height increase to the existing roof-line. (Braddock)

ISSUE #13 - Clarify methodology used for measuring height of accessory structures and increase height of accessory structure that can be located anywhere in the rear or side yards.

- There was no input on this issue. (MGC)
- One individual did not support this recommendation because he believed that the current shed location provisions are still appropriate given that sheds can still be purchased at home improvement stores that are less than 8½ feet in height or a shed that is less than 8½ feet in height could be constructed on a property. (SCGC)
- An existing freestanding one-car garage should be able to be expanded to a two-car garage, provided that the existing roofline is maintained, and this should be accomplished through a combination of this item and Issue #1. (SCGC)
- Accessory structures should not be permitted to be placed on the side or rear lot line for drainage and maintenance reasons. (James Lee)
- Driveways located up to a lot line could cause drainage problems. (James Lee)
- Impacts on not just the adjacent properties but surrounding/nearby properties that are reasonably impacted should be considered in the development of any standards. (NCGC)
- Standards are needed which minimize impacts on neighboring properties and these standards should include landscaping and location considerations. (NCGC)
- Does not support. (Govt. Ctr.)
- No specific issues were noted and there appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (Braddock)

ISSUE #14 - Delete at-grade patios and terraces from the deck definition and permit such structures in any side or rear yard.

- No specific issues were noted and there appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (MGC)
- Does not believe that a patio should be permitted to extend to a rear property line. (SCGC)
- Considers this to be a bad idea and also believes that other accessory structures should not be permitted to be constructed to property line. (SCGC)
- Require a 2 foot setback between patios and property lines (noted that there previously was a 2 foot setback requirement for accessory structures). (SCGC)
- Potential adverse drainage impacts. (SCGC)
- Should not treat a patio like a deck, but there should be some minimum setback for patios. (SCGC)
- Because a person can't fall off a patio, patios should not be regulated like decks. (SCGC)
- Could adversely impact neighbors. (SCGC)
- There should be a lot coverage requirement in a minimum side yard. (James Lee)
- All patios should be required to meet the minimum setback requirements. (James Lee)
- A patio located near a lot line could cause adverse drainage impacts on the adjacent property. (James Lee)
- Because this is a contextual issue, standards are necessary. Such standards should ensure that there are minimal impacts and no nuisances on neighbors. (NCGC)
- Because a freestanding at-grade patio can currently be located anywhere in a side or rear yard without restrictions, it was suggested that standards should be added for such freestanding patios. (NCGC)
- Higher likelihood that a patio could be a nuisance to neighbors than a shed. (NCGC)
- Do not allow patios close to side lot line due to noise, stormwater runoff, etc. reasons. (Govt. Ctr.)
- No specific issues were noted and there appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (Braddock)

ISSUE #15 - Permit lattice screening and/or trellis structures on an above grade deck.

- Question was raised as to how many small lots (particularly townhouse lots) are affected by lattice issue. (MGC)
- Except as noted above, there were no specific issues noted and there appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (MGC)
- Could adversely impacts neighbors. (SCGC)
- There were no specific issues noted. (James Lee)

- There were no specific issues noted. (NCGC)
- Supports this recommendation. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Revise the definition such that lattice screening and/or trellises are no longer considered building additions. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Limit the screening to a maximum height of 6 feet and require that the lattice has a minimum percentage of openness. (Govt. Ctr.)
- No specific issues were noted and there appeared to be an overall general consensus that this was a good idea. (Braddock)

MISCELLANEOUS/GENERAL COMMENTS

- Concerned with lack of standards in previous proposal. (MGC)
- Consideration should be given to establishing either lot coverage or FAR requirements for residential districts. (MGC)
- Keep the current variance process and do not establish new processes that provide for flexibility from zoning requirements. (SCGC)
- Variances are expensive to process, take time and there is no guarantee of approval; therefore, not everyone will want to undergo the variance process and there should be alternatives to variances. (SCGC)
- Distinctions should be made between structures constructed under the current 1978 Zoning Ordinance and structures constructed prior to 1978. (SCGC)
- Clarify that any amendments to the Zoning Ordinance do not impact existing covenants and that the County does not enforce covenants. (SCGC)
- Research how other jurisdictions in Virginia have responded to the Cochran decision. (James Lee)
- Consider giving the Zoning Administrator additional authority to administratively grant modifications as provided by House Bill 2159 which was adopted by the General Assembly in 2005. (James Lee)
- For all proposals, make a distinction between proposals with minimal impacts and proposals with large impacts. (James Lee)
- Consider administrative approvals for minor changes. However, it was noted that 10% may be excessive in certain situations. (James Lee)
- The amendments on these issues should be processed more quickly, particularly given that it has been 1 ½ years since the Cochran decision. (James Lee)
- When considering lot coverage amendments, consideration should be given to neighborhood compatibility. (James Lee)
- Consider applying specific provisions to specific neighborhoods in order to ensure compatibility - Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District. (James Lee)
- There would be multiple impacts on nearby properties if several of these items were pursued at one time for the same property – i.e. increase in fence height and a setback reduction. (NCGC)

- Comments gathered from the public meetings should be posted on the DPZ website so others can see what comments were made at other meetings. Also, allow additional comments to be added after posting on the web. (NCGC)
- Institute a process to address the backlog of variance applications (both previously filed applications and those to be filed as soon as any amendments are adopted). (NCGC)
- There will be a workload issue to process all of the applications that will result if these proposals are adopted, and there must be adequate staff resources to address this workload in an expeditious manner. (NCGC)
- All of the proposals loosen existing standards and it would be hard to tighten these standards at a later date. (Govt. Ctr.)
- Should change the front, side and rear yard definitions. (Braddock)
- Any special permit or special exception approval should reference that HOA regulations must be met and the HOA regulations are not enforced by the County. (Braddock)